

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments is respectfully requested.

1. Applicants Request Reconsideration of the Examiner's Decision Regarding Administrative Withdrawal of Claims 54 and 57

Claims 54 and 57 have been withdrawn by the Examiner for being directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 54 and 57 are dependent claims directed at removing excessive solvent from a solvent soaked cleaning fabric supply roll, where the solvent removal occurs inside a container holding the solvent. Elected Figure 2 discloses both removal of excess solvent inside and outside container (42). Solvent removal is not limited to removal at squeezing surface (54). For example, as shown in elected Figure 2, as the cleaning fabric cloth is being transferred to squeezing surface (54), gravity removes excess solvent from the fabric inside container (42). This example is not intended to limit excessive solvent removal by gravity alone inside the solvent container.

Respectfully, Applicants request that the administrative withdrawal of claims 54 and 57 be reconsidered, and these claims be reinstated for further consideration.

2. Claim 56 is Not Anticipated by Gasparrini et al (US 5,368,157) Because No Sleeve is Required in the Present Invention

Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Gasparrini et al (5,368,157). Gasparrini describes a pre-packaged, pre-soaked cleaning system that utilizes a sleeve to permit transporting and storing the cleaning system without detrimentally affecting the cleaning ability of the cleaning system. (See, Abstract).

The Applicants, on the other hand, specifically claim the exclusion of a sleeve. No sleeve is disposed around the cleaning fabric supply roll as required in Gasparrini et al.

For a reference to anticipate under 35 U.S.C. §102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically disclosed, either expressly or under principles of inherency, in a single reference. Since Gasparrini et al does not identically disclose the claimed invention, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

3. A Prima Facie Case of Obvious Has Not Been Made Because the Cited References Teach Away From What the Applicants Claim

Claim 51, 55, 56, and 58 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Aoki (5,509,353) in view of Gasparrini (5,368,157). Applicants traverse the rejection and submit a prima facie case of obviousness has not been made.

Aoki describes a complex system using supply tubes (78) and a liquid reservoir (77) to pump the cleaning fluid to the sponge. Cleaning fluid is passed through a manifold or guiding member (74) that has a series of small holes that apply the cleaning fluid. Supply tubes (78) carry cleaning fluid from a source (not shown) through a coupler (79) so that cleaning fluid passes or is pumped from the supply tube (78) to liquid reservoir (77). (See Col. 3, lines 60-67; Col. 4, lines 1-15).

Gasparrini describes a pre-packed, pre-soaked cleaning system that utilizes a plastic sleeve to permit the transportation and storage of the system until use of the fabric roll. (See Col. 3, lines 65-68; Col. 4 lines 1-17).

The Applicants, on the other hand, claim a method of presoaking a cleaning fabric supply roll for cleaning a cylinder in a printing press that does not require complex apparatus or a plastic sleeve. The Applicants' invention provides a cleaning fabric supply roll that is pre-soaked, with a low volatility, compound solvent, and then engaged with a printing press having a cylinder to be cleaned. A distinct advantage of the cleaning system of the Applicants' claimed invention is

that it eliminates the need for complex apparatus, such as pumps, spray bars, manifold lines, valves and the like, especially as part of the automatic blanket cleaning systems used on printing machinery to introduce cleansing solvents or solutions to the cleaning fabric.(See, Applicants Specification page 32, lines 10-15). In addition, the Applicants claimed invention does not require a plastic sleeve to prevent disruption of the distribution of solvent in the fabric roll, which would detrimentally affect the cleaning ability of the fabric. None of the cited references teach or suggest such a method.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references teach away from the Applicants claimed invention by requiring complex apparatus or a plastic sleeve. It is well settled that in an obviousness determination consideration must be given to where the references diverge and teach away from the claimed invention. Since the references cited do not teach or suggest what the Applicants have claimed, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been made. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION AND AUTHORIZATION

For at least these reasons, it is believed that all of the claims as presently presented, are patentable, and that this application is now in allowable condition.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for the timely consideration of this amendment under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 0140-4126US4.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: MARCH 8, 2004

Keith McWha
Keith McWha
Reg. No. 44,235

Mailing Address
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154
(212) 415-8705 (direct)
(212) 751-6849 (Fax)